C.L.E.A.N.
Citizens Lobby for Environmental Action Now, Inc. / P.O. Box 5, West Chester, OH 45069

100110

Cheryl Allen
Community Relations Coordinator
Office of Public Affairs
U.S. EPA, Region 5
77 West Jackson Blvd.
Chicago
IL 60604-3590

8/31/92

Subject: Skinner Landfill Phase 1 R.O.D.

Dear Sirs,

Please enter the following comments and questions into the material for consideration before the Phase 1 Record of Decision. The comments relate to fencing the site and the installation of an alternative water supply to certain residents in the area. We request written answers to each of the numbered questions before the R.O.D. is made.

1. Fencing.

Please take account of the following factors in the design and construction of the fence.

1.1 General
Residents have not seen specific details of the Phase 1 proposals, and have concerns about its design and placement. Furthermore, some residents feel that the design of the fencing could benefit from their local knowledge.
We request E.P.A. consults the newly-formed Skinner Coalition and other members of the public during the design process to ensure these concerns are met and a satifactory final design is achieved.

1.2 Enclosure and Fenceline Routing.
The E.P.A. Fact Sheet announcing the Interim Proposal describes the fence as; "a 6ft. tall fence topped with barbed wire around the portions of the site which are contaminated"
The Feasability Study called for roughly 5500 linear ft. of 6 ft. chainlink fence with 2 strands of barbed wire at the top. This would equate to an enclosed area of 45 to 55 acres depending on the shape of the enclosure.
Question 1. What is this the area proposed at this point?

The location of the fence relative to the features of the site has not been defined. In view of the uncertainties about the contents of the site, the fence must encompass all areas which pose a possible threat to the public. In addition to those areas which are simply "contaminated", this would include threats from physical objects and equipment, natural hazards (such as the steep-sided ponds on site) and activities or operations which may be carried out on the site.

1.3 Notices.
The fence should carry notices at key locations to warn of the hazards on the site.

1.4 Access.
Access to hazardous areas of the site must be controlled. Gates must be normally locked with entry controlled by authorized personnel. There must be sufficient entry points to ensure access for emergency vehicles to reach the whole site.

1.5 Maintenance
Adequate resources must be set aside to ensure that the fence can be maintained in a secure manner until the hazards of the site have diminished to a level where authorised entry is no longer needed.

1.6 Visual Appearance.
The fence will become a long-term feature of Old West Chester. We believe that site security can be achieved without creating an eyesore. Chain link fencing can trap windblown debris and become unsightly very quickly. In visually sensitive areas consideration shoud be given to alternative designs or natural screening of the fence itself.

1.7 Easements
Question 2. Will any easements be required to install the fence?

2.0 Alternate Water Supply.

2.1 Survey.
The Fact Sheet states that, "U.S. E.P.A. proposes to provide alternate water supply to those potentially affected users of groundwater in the near future."
Question 3. What method will be used to define those users?

2.2 Cost.
Question 4. Will residents be asked to bear any of the cost of the changeover to district water?

2.3 Data on Threat to Groundwater.

The Fact Sheet states that, "U.S. E.P.A.'s evaluation of contamination potential will be based on hydrogeology of the area and the behavior of the contaminants of concern."

Question 5. Has this analysis been done?

Question 6. If not, what was the basis for the statements by E.P.A. at the Public Meeting of 7-29-92 that; "Material in the waste lagoon cannot be reliably contained and poses a significant risk if exposure occurs, i.e. principal threat.", and; "Containment alternatives pose risk to sole source aquifer drinking water supply underlying the region."

These statements contrast markedly from the conclusions given in the Phase II Remedial investigation. In Section 6.0 Summary and Conclusions on Page 107 it is stated; "The results of the Phase II Remedial Investigation indicate that there is limited potential for significant offsite migration of contaminants from the Skinner Landfill.

The only evidence of contaminants potentially leaving the site through groundwater migration was a detection of ethylbenzene at 5ug/l from the bedrock well GW24 located across the East Fork of the Mill Creek from the buried waste lagoon. This low concentration and the fact that only a single organic parameter was detected may indicate that the ethylbenzene detection was invalid."

This hardly suggests a major risk and is dismissive of even the one shred of evidence of offsite migration.

Question 7. Does E.P.A. have additional evidence beyond the Phase II Remedial Investigation to support the claims that the risk to the aquifer is "significant"?

Question 8. Have the risks to the users of the aquifer been quantified?

Question 9. Is there, in fact, an aquifer underlying the site as suggested by the E.P.A. chart shown at the 7/29/92 Public Meeting?

Question 10. Is it a "sole source" aquifer and when was it so designated?

Sincerely,

L Butler

Lawrence Butler (President C.L.E.A.N. Inc.)

cc Chairman, Skinner Coalition